# U.S. Department of Education 2011 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

A Public School

School Type (Public Schools):		~		
(Check all that apply, if any)	Charter	Title 1	Magnet	Choice
Name of Principal: Mr. Jack S	<u>patola</u>			
Official School Name: Beacon	School of E	<u>xcellence</u>		
_	325 4th Aven Brooklyn, NY	<u>ue</u> 7 11232-1701		
County: <u>Brooklyn</u>	State School (	Code Number:	3315000101	<u>72</u>
Telephone: (718) 965-4200 I			-	portals/15/k172
I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and			-	ity requirements on page 2 (Part in Information is accurate.
			]	Date
(Principal's Signature)				
Name of Superintendent*: Ms.	Anita Skopp	Superintende	ent e-mail: <u>AS</u>	kop@schools.nyc.gov
District Name: NYC District 15	5 District Ph	one: <u>(718)</u> 935	5-4317	
I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and				ity requirements on page 2 (Part is accurate.
			]	Date
(Superintendent's Signature)				
Name of School Board Preside	nt/Chairperso	n: Mr. Jim De	<u>vor</u>	
I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and				ity requirements on page 2 (Part is accurate.
			]	Date
(School Board President's/Cha	irperson's Sig	gnature)		

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

<sup>\*</sup>Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
- 3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2010-2011 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
- 4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
- 5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2005.
- 6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010.
- 7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## All data are the most recent year available.

#### **DISTRICT**

1. Number of schools in the district: 25 Elementary schools

(per district designation) 13 Middle/Junior high schools

0 High schools 0 K-12 schools

38 Total schools in district

2. District per-pupil expenditure: 17258

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

- 3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: <u>Urban or large central city</u>
- 4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 27
- 5. Number of students as of October 1, 2010 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total			# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	23	30	53		6	0	0	0
K	54	44	98		7	0	0	0
1	56	39	95		8	0	0	0
2	40	53	93		9	0	0	0
3	52	44	96		10	0	0	0
4	34	38	72		11	0	0	0
5	35	51	86		12	0	0	0
	Total in Applying School:						593	

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:	0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
-	2 % Asian
-	3 % Black or African American
	82 % Hispanic or Latino
-	0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
-	13 % White
-	0 % Two or more races
_	100 % Total
-	<del></del>

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2009-2010 school year: 5% This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year.	13
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year.	15
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	28
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2009	587
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.05
<b>(6)</b>	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	5

8. Percent limited English proficient students in the school:	30%
Total number of limited English proficient students in the school:	178
Number of languages represented, not including English:	10
Specify languages:	

Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Cantonese, Czech, French, German, Filipino, Polish and Spanish

-	1377711	
- 1	1NY11	

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:

91%

Total number of students who qualify:

537

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services:

24%

Total number of students served:

144

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

3 Autism	Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	9 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	59 Specific Learning Disability
0 Emotional Disturbance	68 Speech or Language Impairment
0 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
0 Mental Retardation	O Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0 Multiple Disabilities	5 Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

#### Number of Staff

	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	3	0
Classroom teachers	30	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	13	7
Paraprofessionals	3	0
Support staff	5	2
Total number	54	9

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1:

20:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only high schools need to supply graduation rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any student or teacher attendance rates under 95% and teacher turnover rates over 12% and fluctuations in graduation rates.

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	95%	95%	94%
Daily teacher attendance	95%	93%	94%	94%	93%
Teacher turnover rate	6%	12%	8%	16%	24%
High school graduation rate	%	%	%	%	%

If these data are not available, explain and provide reasonable estimates.

Teacher attendance rates lower than 95% and turnover rates greater than 12% are the direct result teachers taking maternity leaves and subsequent child care leaves. In the last five years, 14 teachers have taken a maternity leave followed by an extended child care leave.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools): Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2010 are doing as of Fall 2010.

Graduating class size:	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	%
Enrolled in a community college	<del></del> %
Enrolled in vocational training	<del></del> %
Found employment	<del></del> %
Military service	<del></del> %
Other	<del></del> %
Total	0%

PS 172 is a pre-k through 5th grade elementary school located in the heart of the Sunset Park section of Brooklyn, New York. Sunset Park is an economically depressed, densely populated and remarkably diverse community with a large percentage of recent immigrants having ties to multiple ethnic groups. Our school's population is reflective of this diversity with 91% of our students living at or below the poverty line and thirty-five percent of our students classified as English language learners. Spanish, however, is the most prevalent language spoken in our school with close to 83% of our students coming from Hispanic households and 70% of our students coming from homes where Spanish is the primary language spoken.

PS 172 has been a mainstay in Sunset Park for close to 100 years and is a community school in every sense of the word. Our school works in partnership with our students' families as well as the Sunset Park community and has established and maintained a very successful partnership with Lutheran Medical Center which sponsors a school-based medical clinic and dental clinic and also provides on-site mental health services. Together, these programs afford our students and their families with primary medical and dental care as well as a certified mental health program that provides individual, group and family counseling to those in need. These services, in consonance with mandated services provided by our school based clinical speech pathologists, physical therapists and occupational therapists, have opened our school to even more children in Sunset Park and have allowed our school to grow along with the needs of our community.

In the past decade, PS 172 has opened its doors to an increasing number of students with special needs. In addition to servicing students in a traditional SETSS program (Special Education Teacher Support Services), PS 172 has created 6 Integrated Co-Teaching classes, one class for each grade level. This change in our school's organization has allowed PS 172 to accept an even greater number of students in our community into our school.

A large part of what makes our school so successful with all students is the fact that we are a school community that shares the common vision that all children are capable of learning at very high levels provided they are given the time and the expert instruction necessary to do so. As such, PS 172 has done a great deal to align the organizational and academic structures in our school to maximize our students' success and to inspire our students to fulfill our school's mission; that is, to acquire and use the knowledge, skills and behaviors necessary to succeed in a culturally diverse and technologically advanced society.

Part of maximizing our student's success has translated into the way in which our school day is structured. In addition to our academic after school and Saturday programs, in which classroom teachers are given the opportunity to work with their own "at-risk" students an additional 3-6 hours per week, our school day has increased from 6 hours and 20 minutes to 6 hours and fifty minutes for our entire student population. This increase in the school day originated from a 2006 agreement between the UFT and the NYCDOE in which the school day was lengthened for 1/3 of each school's student population and designed to service each school's at-risk learners in groups of no larger than ten students. In our school's effort to make this time increase work for our students, PS 172 teachers overwhelmingly voted to increase the length of the school day for all students, using every member of our school's staff to ensure that the additional time for small group instruction, whether it be focused on remediation or enrichment, was a reality for all learners.

This shift in the school day allowed our school to implement another important organizational change. In addition to giving more instructional time for students, our school also committed to giving every teacher in our building more time to learn as well. This time is built into the school day and gives teachers on every grade a block of 95 consecutive minutes each week to work with their colleagues as well as our

school's literacy and math coaches and supervisors to plan and revise curriculum, explore and refine instructional practices as well as engage in a myriad of professional development activities.

PS 172's success is due in large part to our school's commitment to professional development. Much of our professional development work has been focused on differentiating instruction and providing teaching and learning experiences that match each student's individual needs and capacities. A good deal of work at our extended grade level meetings has focused on using data to inform our work in curriculum planning, implementation, assessment and revision.

Our school's commitment to collaboration and data driven decision making is evidenced by our many impressive accomplishments. Since 2006, more than 95% of our third, fourth and fifth graders have met or exceeded grade level standards on the New York State English Language Arts and Mathematics exams. Since 2008, PS 172 has consistently received the Department of Education's Excellence Award and has been named an "outstanding" school, scoring in the 99th percentile of all elementary schools citywide. Our most recent test data places PS 172 in the top 5 of New York City's highest achieving schools. PS 172's accomplishments have been chronicled by the New York Times, The Washington Post, The Wall Street Journal and the Daily News. It was however, our own local paper, *The Sunset Park Chronicle* that described PS 172 best, when in an April 2010 article referred to our school simply as "...the little elementary school that could".

#### 1. Assessment Results:

PS 172 participates in The New York State Testing Program for both English Language Arts and Mathematics. The assessments, published by CTB McGraw-Hill, are based on the NYS State Learning Standards and the Core Curriculum and are designed to measure yearly student progress. Results are reported via performance levels:

Level 1 – below standard

Level 2 – meets basic standard

Level 3 – meets proficiency standard

Level 4 – exceeds proficiency standard

\* For more information about the NYS testing Program please visit NYS office of Student Assessment at <a href="http://www.p12.nysed.gov/osa/">http://www.p12.nysed.gov/osa/</a>

Over the past five years, PS 172's test scores have exceeded the adequate yearly progress goals set by New York State and have remained consistently high. During this time our school's average scores in mathematics show that 99.6% of our students have met or exceeded proficiency standards and 95.2% of our students have met or exceeded proficiency standards in English Language Arts. In 2010, when NYS raised the cut scores for the basic and proficient performance levels for both the ELA and Mathematics tests, PS 172 was one of the few schools state-wide that showed a consistency in scores, with a school average of 95% of students meeting or exceeding standard in ELA and 99% in math.

This year, our school's leadership team recognized a disparity between the percentage of all students in the third grade meeting or exceeding proficiency standards in ELA and the percentage of special education students meeting or exceeding those same standards in the third grade. Overall, 93% of our third graders met or exceeded standard while just 81% of our special education students met that same benchmark.

Upon notice of the disparity, an inquiry team was formed. Included on the team were our school's Principal and Assistant Principal, two literacy coaches, two intervention teachers, all four of our grade 4 teachers and two third grade teachers. The team began by examining student scores on the 2010 NYS ELA using the item analysis tool provided by ARIS (ARIS is an innovative, computer based system that allows users to view and organize a wide variety of student information, including test data). The item analysis tool allowed the team to analyze student errors on the exam. When no similarities emerged between students in the testing group, the team turned their attention to other assessment information. What emerged as a "common problem" for this group of students was poor reading fluency. The team then refocused their investigation to look for specific reasons for the disfluency. A Reading Rate assessment was administered and it was discovered that when encountering text just above their independent reading level, the students who were the focus of this inquiry were unable to successfully decode many unknown words thereby compromising their reading rate. Teachers were asked to conduct a word feature assessment to determine specific decoding deficits and once defined, students were placed in a small group intervention program designed to meet their specific needs. Furthermore, an investigation of the word study program in grade k-2 revealed some "holes" in the curriculum. More specifically, words featuring long vowel patterns or vowel teams were not introduced to students at a rate commensurate with their reading level. Representatives from each grade, along with the lower grade literacy coach and school supervisors, are in the process of revising the lower grade word study program. Our school has decided to construct a more "rules based" approach to word study, making sure that the curriculum includes a much more prominent multi-sensory component that keeps pace with expected reading level benchmarks.

#### 2. Using Assessment Results:

The PS 172 school community has been set on a path of continuous improvement for many years. We have worked very hard to implement a core curriculum that is responsive to our students' ever changing needs. We continue to refine our work with curriculum and instruction and the organizational systems and structures that support that work, through a process of constant reassessment and revision.

This revision process relies heavily on the data collected from a variety of sources including standardized test and predictive test data, individual student portfolios (which include work samples from teacher created end of unit assessments in all subject areas, complete with attached rubrics), reading level data, a reading and writing skill analysis, classroom and intervention teachers' conference notes, and parent and student feedback.

Several systems are in place to ensure that our instructional program is aligned to the data we collect throughout the year. These systems include:

<u>Weekly extended grade meetings/ Professional development work</u> - During this time, teachers work together with coaches and supervisors to examine and adapt current and/or upcoming units of study to meet the needs of our students. Curriculum adaptations are informed by a variety of assessments including periodic assessments, end of unit assessments and school created "predictive exams".

<u>Weekly Cabinet Meetings</u> - During this time administrators and coaches (and periodically grade leaders) meet to discuss data and make decisions about how our analysis of this data will reflect changes in our work with curriculum, instruction and professional development in current school year and in years to come.

May and June Planning - During our May and June planning sessions, grade level teams work together to develop yearlong curriculum calendars in reading, writing, mathematics and social studies. These meetings begin with teachers studying state and city-wide curriculum mandates, performance standards and cumulative assessment data collected throughout the school year which includes an error analysis of standardized test data using an item analysis tool. After this analysis, teachers begin the planning process for each separate unit of study by asking and answering two essential questions: First, what is it that my students should know and be able to do at the end of each unit of study (and by extension, the end of the school year)? Second, what kinds of assessments need to be built into each unit of study to provide tangible evidence of students learning? Once these questions are asked and answered, teachers, coaches and administrators begin mapping out specific units of study and our full year curriculum calendar.

## 3. Communicating Assessment Results:

At PS 172, we understand that parents are our students' first and best teachers and must remain an active part of their child's education for our school to be truly successful. Our school makes a concerted effort to involve our parents in celebrating the successes of both our school and our students and encourages our parents to become equally involved in the planning and implementation of our instructional agenda.

At the beginning of every school year, each classroom teacher hosts a curriculum orientation meeting, unveiling our yearly curricula in all major subject areas. This orientation is followed up with monthly, grade specific curriculum meetings scheduled to follow our PTA meetings. During these meetings, a grade level representative specifies the skills, strategies and content that will be covered in the units of study for the coming month. Here, parents are also introduced to the end of unit assessment their child will be taking to assess their proficiency with the skills and strategies taught in the unit. Information about each end of unit assessment is accompanied by the rubric that teachers will use to grade the work as well as anchor papers to provide parents with work samples that demonstrate the work we expect students to complete in order to meet or exceed grade level standards. At the end of each unit of study, parents receive written feedback from their child's teacher detailing each child's strengths and weaknesses as demonstrated in their end of unit assessment results.

Assessment results are also shared through individual score reports published by NY state. In addition to providing parents with their child's individual scaled score and proficiency level on standardized tests, the report explains their child's strengths and weaknesses. State tests and their results are shared with our entire community at PTA meetings, leadership team meetings and in workshops arranged by our school's parent coordinator.

In addition to 3 yearly progress reports, the teachers at PS 172 also prepare an extensive intervention plan for all students we consider "at-risk" for not meeting grade level standards (tier II intervention) or promotional criteria (tier I). In these plans, classroom teachers, working with intervention teachers and service providers, detail each child's strengths and weaknesses and craft an explicit written plan to address those weaknesses. Teachers meet with parents and families (3-6 times per year) to review the plans which contain a detailed parent component complete with materials such as books, workbooks, flashcards, games and lists of websites. Upper grade teachers also host informational meetings about state exams followed by individual meetings with parents interested in conducting an item level analysis of their child's predictive exams.

## 4. Sharing Lessons Learned:

At PS 172, we acknowledge that sharing best practices, both within our building and outside of it, fosters a culture of collaborative inquiry and pushes us, as educators, to be reflective of our own work. It is for this reason, teachers, coaches and supervisors are encouraged to become part of a learning community. Throughout our 20 year association with Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project, PS 172 has emerged as a model school for the Project and has opened its doors to schools across the city, state and nation so they may learn from our practices and consider their "next steps" in the implementation of a balanced literacy program. Our school's two literacy coaches are also part of a study group at the Project and meet monthly to share information and ideas with other project schools in the city. In the last five years, PS 172 has opened its doors to educators and researchers from schools and school districts all over the world. We have become a living laboratory of sorts, offering educators a customized school tour followed by a debriefing session tailored to meet their specific needs. The focus of some recent visits have included:

- Supporting English language learners as emergent readers (a public school in Brooklyn)
- Differentiating instruction in the literacy block (NYC public school from Staten Island)
- How to build a school around the needs of each student (I-Zone charter school directors)
- Designing school structures and systems to offer students enrichment as well as intervention services (School Principals and Superintendents visiting from Korea)
- The Balanced Literacy Block (principals, coaches and teachers from Long Beach, California)
- The Structures and Teaching yielding the most effective results on standardized tests (NYC department of Education ELA Instructional/ Achievement Specialist)

In addition, PS 172 has recently signed on to become part of the "Peer Review" process, a new evaluative initiative established by the New York City Department of Education. The "Peer Review" partners two schools so that they may "...offer (one another) collegial support in improving the quality of educational and organizational practices." This process is due to begin in the spring of 2011.

#### 1. Curriculum:

At PS 172 we are committed to building academic rigor into every lesson in every classroom. This is achieved through a carefully crafted curriculum that spirals across grade levels to scaffold the complexity of both the content and the skills and strategies students use to access that content.

We use a workshop model of instruction in all content areas and structure lessons in two ways. The majority of lessons are delivered via a mini-lesson format. The 10 minute mini-lesson has a specific architecture designed to feature a single teaching point and supports our work in clarity of instruction. Seminar is the second lesson structure used in our school. Seminar style lessons are usually used to launch a unit of study, particularly in the areas of reading and writing. Seminar lessons last between 15 and 25 minutes and allow a teacher the freedom to explore a shared text with their students in an "I try, you try" format; demonstrating, in small manageable chunks, how an expert approaches reading or writing in a specific genre and then encouraging students to process text in a similar way.

At our school, grade level teams work together for several full day planning sessions in May and June to develop yearlong curriculum guides in all content areas. These meetings begin with teachers studying state and city-wide curriculum mandates and the recently adopted common core standards, as well as cumulative assessment data collected throughout the school year. The guides that are created detail 8-10 units of study in reading, writing and mathematics and 5-8 units of study in social studies and science. Each unit of study includes a suggested sequence of lessons, mid unit and end of unit assessments and is anchored by rubrics and student samples of exemplary work. Our curriculum guides are necessary because the curriculum created at PS 172 is not part of a prepackaged program; rather it is an amalgamation of many programs, combined with teacher created material crafted to meet the specific needs of the students in our school. An overview of the content explored in each curriculum area can be summarized as follows:

- In our English Language Arts program all genres of fiction and nonfiction are explored in a balanced literacy program. The curriculum is a re-envisioned version of Teacher's College reading and writing workshop suited to meet the needs of our students and includes a variety of components in addition to the workshop. These components include read-aloud, shared reading and writing, guided reading and writing, and individual and group conferences.
- Our Mathematics curriculum is an amalgamation of several programs including "Math in the City", "Everyday Math" and Addison-Wesley. Our curriculum is designed so that mathematical ideas are presented as an interconnected set of relationships rather than a string of facts to be memorized. Children are encouraged to be problem solvers and use a variety of strategies.
- The Science curriculum at PS 172 is hands-on and inquiry based. Content is focused around two strands: the physical setting and the living environment and is explored through programs such as FOSS, LHS Gems, Holt science and Scott Foresman science.
- The social studies curriculum at PS 172 is grade specific with students in kindergarten through second grade studying topics that teach them more about themselves, their families, their neighborhoods as well as communities great and small. In third through fifth grade, students study the diversity of world communities, the evolution of New York State and the emergence of our new nation as well as the similarities and differences of nations in the western hemisphere.
- The arts program at PS 172 is tightly connected to our social studies curriculum. Through classes in music, dance and reader's theater, students have the opportunity to explore the history and the traditions of the cultures explored in their classroom. After school programs such as choir, ballet and two yearly theater productions, allow our students a more comprehensive exploration of the arts.
- Physical and health education are explored in the "Physical Best" program, the core curriculum for fitness and physical education in New York City. The Physical Best program supports students as they engage in a wide variety of sports and activities and learn not only the rules of

the activity but "...why the activity is important and how it will benefit them today and for a lifetime." Our work in physical and health education is supplemented through our partnership with Lutheran hospital, Child Health Plus and the New Jersey Nets in an initiative called "Shoot for Better Health." The program provides education for students and their families about nutrition and fitness and encourages healthy lifestyles.

## 2. Reading/English:

PS 172's balanced literacy program is based on the premise that simply telling students that reading and writing are important is not sufficient. If we are to truly communicate their importance, we need to live the lives of readers and writers and create enough time in each day to read and write and practice the skills readers and writers need to be proficient.

In kindergarten through fifth grade, instruction in reading is centered around the comprehension skills of monitoring for meaning, determining importance, envisioning, making connections, inferring and synthesizing. Reading workshop units of study are designed to last between two to six weeks, depending on the genre or topic featured in the unit, and explore a variety of fiction and nonfiction texts. Each classroom supports individual units of study with a vast library that students use to anchor their work in class and borrow from to encourage their reading at home.

The components of our daily balanced literacy program include: read-aloud, reader's workshop, writer's workshop, guided reading and writing and independent reading and writing. In kindergarten through second grade, a daily word study, interactive writing and a shared reading component balance out the program.

The balanced literacy framework supports our school's goal of differentiating instruction. A key tenant of the program is that you begin with readers (or writers) where they are and through carefully scaffolded mini-lessons or individual reading conferences; you move the reader (or writer) to where they need to be. There are multiple opportunities for assessment within each component of the workshop and our teacher's work hard to continually refine their skills in assessing students and using that information to construct lessons that meet the needs of each individual student.

In weekly grade conferences, where classroom teachers work with supervisors, coaches and grade specific intervention teachers, curriculum guides and individual lessons are refined to reflect the needs of the learners in each individual classroom. During these meetings, intervention groups are formed or reconfigured and teachers work together to ensure each student is making adequate progress toward meeting grade level standards.

The read-aloud(s) are carefully selected because they represent the elements of craft and/or genre that will be explored in the upcoming writing unit. This early immersion into genre and craft benefits all learners but is critically important for our English language learners. This preview allows teachers the time to build necessary background knowledge as well as target and develop specific vocabulary for students. Our English language learners receive additional support from ESL and intervention teachers, who can further develop background knowledge and vocabulary through the use of visuals and when appropriate, demonstrations. Because our intervention staff works in a specific grade and plan with their students classroom teachers each week, they can supplement the read aloud and writing work with book selections that meet the needs of the genre and craft to be explored and also offer additional supports for our English language learners.

The school's long term partnership with Columbia University's Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project gives us access to the most current and effective methodologies for reading and writing instruction. Two full time school based literacy coaches work with our teachers to continually refine every aspect of our reading program. Particular emphasis is placed on individual student assessment to achieve the singular goal of meeting and advancing each child's journey toward becoming a proficient reader.

#### 3. Mathematics:

The mathematics curriculum at PS 172 is inquiry based and combines several different math programs to create a curriculum that is wholly our own. Just as we develop curriculum guides for our reading and writing units of study, so do we create a Mathematics guide.

In a Mathematics unit of study, the first several lessons of the unit are designed as "discovery lessons". In these lessons, teachers pose problems and allow students to work individually or with partners to come up with their own ways to approach and solve the problem. Launching a unit this way encourages our students to be problem solvers and at the same time provides our teachers with some valuable assessment data. The data generated during our "discovery" lessons help teachers understand the way the unit may need to be revised to better represent the needs of the learners in the class. It also helps classroom teachers and intervention teachers form initial guided math groups.

Following the "discovery" portion of the unit, teachers move into a series of mini-lessons designed to provide the direct, explicit instruction students need to develop an understanding of the skills and strategies that will be taught in the unit of study.

All teaching within our units of study in math is anchored with mid-unit and end of unit assessments. Daily assessment opportunities are built into each lesson. This daily generated data allow educators to be very precise in their work with the whole class, small groups and with each individual student.

Meeting the needs of all learners in each classroom requires highly specific lesson planning. This kind of planning is made possible through a careful consideration of the learning styles of each student in the class. All lessons are created to address visual, auditory and sensory learners. Students have access to laptop computers in every classroom and use multisensory software to reinforce specific skills. Smart boards are available to provide visual stimulus and lessons are always reinforced with auditory cues. Students having trouble with content area vocabulary, work in small groups to create a math glossary complete with written definition and picture cues. Homework for all learners is as differentiated as their classroom experience.

#### 4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Social studies content is explored through a Making Connections program, using authentic nonfiction, historical fiction and primary source documents to explore history. Integrating social studies into our reading and writing units of study has allowed us to successfully compact curriculum. The making connections program is supplemented with partnerships we have established with several local historical associations. These partnerships help bring history alive for our students and our location in Brooklyn, New York gives us the opportunity to use the entire city of New York as a living laboratory, anchoring all that students learn in books and in class to a living, breathing representation of that history.

One such partnership includes "The Old Stone House" a Historic House Trust of New York City, where students explore colonial life and the Revolutionary War in a reconstructed 1699 Dutch farm house. Our work with Greenwood Cemetery to study the Civil War, with Brooklyn Museum to study Native American and early Dutch colonial life, the New York City Parks Department to study navigation and the Tenement Museum to study life for immigrants in the 1920's are just a few of the opportunities our students have to interact with history.

#### **5. Instructional Methods:**

Our success with differentiating instruction is what has distinguished PS 172 from so many other schools. The teaching and learning that continues to flourish at our school is built on the foundation that instruction should be differentiated and individualized to meet the needs of each student. And that instruction is most effective when it is driven by assessment and shaped and sharpened by ongoing professional development.

Several structures are in place at our school to ensure that each student receives the right kind of instruction at exactly the right time. PS 172's intervention team is made up of both full and part time teachers. Our part time staff, or F-Status staff, represent 60% of our total intervention staff, and is composed of some of the best and brightest teachers at PS 172, are currently on child care leaves. Prior to their "leaves of absence" these teachers had become an integral part of our teaching and learning community and had come to know our students and their families very well. Because of their training, their expertise and the ties each teacher had with our school, our school community felt that it was important to maintain that connection. Our F-status intervention teaching program offers that connection and ensures that our students, many of whom have great academic needs, work with highly trained and extremely knowledgeable teachers.

The intervention staff is structured in such a way that teachers are assigned to work with a specific grade level. That grade specific designation is critical to the success of our program because it allows our teachers the freedom to push in to specific classrooms on a daily basis, and work with students without having to pull them away from the ongoing instruction in their classroom. During the time they push into a classroom, intervention teachers act as a second classroom teacher, providing a mini-lesson to a small group of students, followed by work with a guided reading group as well as individual conferences. The students that are selected to work with the intervention teacher may represent a wide variety of student subgroups. Students are chosen, not for their designation as an English language learner or a special education student, but are chosen because assessment data shows that they have a demonstrated need. The groups are flexible and change from unit to unit or from guided reading group to guided reading group. The mini-lesson led by the intervention teacher is based on the same skills, and/or the same genre studied by the larger classroom group. The individualization comes from the choice of instructional materials, the amount or type of background provided for the lesson or the amount of teacher support provided in the lesson.

In addition to the intervention provided to students during the school day, PS 172 has an extensive array of after-school programs. What is particularly effective about our academic after school program is that it is a natural extension of the school day. Children work in groups of no larger than ten students, in their classroom, with their classroom teacher for an additional three hours per week. PS 172 also hosts a Saturday school program as well as an after school recreation program and dance and music classes.

#### **6. Professional Development:**

Our school embraces the notion that the most effective way to improve the achievement of students is to improve the quality of teaching. The professional development program at PS 172 is curriculum centered, standards based and a direct outgrowth of the school's goals developed by our leadership team and outlined in our Comprehensive Educational Plan.

PS 172's professional development program is multi-layered. In addition to the instructional leadership provided by school supervisors, three full time content area coaches are on staff. Two coaches work in the area of literacy, one coach in kindergarten through second grade and another in grades three through five. A third coach works with teachers in kindergarten through fifth grade in the area of mathematics instruction.

Coaches work with individual teachers in 4-6 week cycles. Coaches, like teachers, work using the "gradual release of responsibility method". As coaches begin work with teachers, they usually start by demonstrating a lesson. As teachers become more competent with the skill, strategy or the lesson architecture being demonstrated, the coach will take a step back into a co-teaching role, allowing the classroom teacher to take the lead. In the final stages of the cycle, the coach observes the lesson and provides feedback to the teacher, repeating this process until the goals of the cycle have been met. Supervisors observe both teacher and coach at predefined stages of the cycle to offer feedback and then once again at the end of the unit to consider the "next step" in that teacher's professional development plan.

In addition to our in-house professional development, PS 172 has maintained a long-time partnership with Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project. The Project provides in-house professional development as well as offers our staff the opportunity to attend subject and grade specific professional development workshops and summertime "reading and writing" institutes.

Grade specific leaders in math, reading, writing, and social studies as well as our school's science laboratory teacher, act as mentors to their fellow teachers on the grade. These curriculum leadership roles were awarded to teachers because of their demonstrated excellence in the specific subject area and are particularly useful for teachers who may not be currently involved in a professional development cycle but need help with a specific student or a specific lesson.

Study groups and inquiry groups are developed as an outgrowth of our professional needs. Our students' learning challenges as well as the pedagogical or content based challenges our staff face, generate the questions our study and inquiry groups are based on.

Our professional development program, much like our grade specific units of study, is under constant review. Data about the program comes from a variety of sources including individual teacher conferences, formal and informal teacher observations, professional development cycle outcomes as well as a review of class specific and standardized test assessment data.

## 7. School Leadership:

Beginning in the 2005-2006 school year, PS 172 became one of the first 200 schools in NYC to become an empowerment school. The empowerment moniker has allowed our school to take charge of making decisions that affect our students most. Those decisions include but are not limited to choosing staff, controlling budget, and making decisions about curriculum. While the principal of PS 172 is first and foremost the instructional leader of the school, his 27 years of leadership has evolved to include a very collaborative approach to decision making. Just like the curriculum and instruction at our school are open to a process of constant assessment and revision, the direction our school takes is open to the exact same process. There are several systems in place to ensure that the direction of our school is tied to the needs of our students. The systems are as follows:

- School leadership team planning Our school leadership team's membership includes representatives from every stakeholder in our school community. The team meets monthly to collect and review program evaluation data, questioning whether or not the structures and programs in place at our school are bringing about the level of academic excellence articulated in our school's vision and mission statements. The team also advises the principal on how best to expend our school's financial resources.
- Weekly Grade Level Meetings are comprised of grade specific teachers, our literacy and math
  coaches as well as school supervisors. These weekly meetings enable our school community to
  evaluate how well our instructional and organizational systems are functioning in direct response
  to student achievement
- Weekly Cabinet Meetings involve school supervisors and our literacy and math coaches. During these meetings, supervisors present and discuss data gathered during daily classroom visits. The data is focused on both teacher and student performance. Coaches discuss their work with teachers who are presently engaged in a professional development cycle of study. These cabinet meetings along with weekly grade level meetings help to focus our school's professional development plan.
- <u>Teacher Conferences</u> Our principal begins and ends each school year by meeting with teachers.
  These meetings provide the school cabinet as well as the principal with some very valuable
  information about the direction teachers hope to take with their professional growth and their
  input about the materials and structures that will best support their students.

Under the leadership and encouragement of the principal, teachers, coaches and assistant principals at PS 172 are always encouraged to assume positions of leadership. Teachers showing great pedagogical skill are encouraged to become mentors to new teachers and curriculum leaders on a specific grade level.

Teachers with demonstrated success as a mentor or curriculum leader are encouraged to become content area coaches. Coaches and teachers are encouraged to continue their formal education and pursue a second Masters for the credentials necessary to become a school administrator. In the last five years, one of our assistant principals has gone on to become a principal, two coaches have become assistant principals, two teachers have become coaches and four teachers are in the process of securing their advanced degree in administration and supervision.

## **PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: New York State Testing Program Mathematics Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	May	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	99	100	100	100	99
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	83	67	76	76	63
Number of students tested	76	81	70	72	71
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	Disadvantaged St	tudents			
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	99	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	78	65	76	76	57
Number of students tested	74	68	70	72	14
2. African American Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	98	100	100	100	98
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	82	65	80	77	62
Number of students tested	60	65	55	60	55
4. Special Education Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	76	42	84	67	55
Number of students tested	21	26	19	12	11
5. English Language Learner Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	84	50	62	74	48
Number of students tested	31	30	26	19	23
ó.					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: For the 2009-2010 school year results, the NY State Education Dept. raised the ELA and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the % of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.'

Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8\_Results07282010.html http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents\_Approve\_Scoring\_Changes.html"

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: NYS Testing Program English Language Arts Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	93	95	96	99	96
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	51	28	20	26	30
Number of students tested	76	81	70	73	48
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	Disadvantaged St	tudents			
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	92	94	96	99	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	47	24	20	26	8
Number of students tested	74	68	70	73	12
2. African American Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	93	94	96	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	58	25	18	21	24
Number of students tested	60	65	55	61	37
4. Special Education Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	81	19	89	100	
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	43	85	0	14	
Number of students tested	21	26	19	14	
5. English Language Learner Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	90	90	88	95	
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	58	23	4	5	
Number of students tested	31	30	26	21	
6.					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: For the 2009-2010 school year results, the NY State Education Dept. raised the ELA and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the % of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Sr. Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, 'These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.' Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8\_Results07282010.html http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents\_Approve\_Scoring\_Changes.html' Prior to the 2006-2007 school year, students who had attended school in the United States for less than three consecutive school years were allowed to take the NYSESLAT in lieu of the grades 3-8 English Language Arts assessment.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: New York State Testing Program Mathematics Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	97
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	95	99	88	83	58
Number of students tested	76	75	67	72	76
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic l	Disadvantaged St	udents			
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	94	100	88	83	75
Number of students tested	67	67	67	72	12
2. African American Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	97
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	94	98	89	84	60
Number of students tested	62	57	56	55	58
4. Special Education Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	88	100	80	94	74
Number of students tested	26	22	15	16	19
5. English Language Learner Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	95
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	87	95	90	90	53
Number of students tested	23	21	10	20	19
6.					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					

NOTES: For the 2009-2010 school year results, the NY State Education Dept. raised the ELA and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the % of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, 'These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.' Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8\_Results07282010.html http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents\_Approve\_Scoring\_Changes.html'

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: NYS Testing Program English Language Arts Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	96	99	99	86	91
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	8	10	13	14	7
Number of students tested	76	72	67	72	58
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	Disadvantaged St	tudents			
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	96	98	99	86	
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	7	6	13	14	
Number of students tested	67	65	67	72	
2. African American Students				<u> </u>	
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	95	98	98	82	93
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	8	7	14	9	7
Number of students tested	62	55	56	55	44
1. Special Education Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	88	95	100	63	64
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	12	5	20	6	0
Number of students tested	26	22	15	16	14
5. English Language Learner Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	91	94	90	70	
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	4	0	0	0	
Number of students tested	23	18	10	20	
5.					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: For the 2009-2010 school year results, the NY State Education Dept. raised the ELA and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the % of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.' Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8\_Results07282010.html http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents\_Approve\_Scoring\_Changes.html" Prior to the 2006-2007 school year, students who had attended school in the United States for less than three consecutive school years were allowed to take the NYSESLAT in lieu of the grades 3-8 ELA assessment. Students not scored as proficient on the NYSESLAT and attending school in the United States for less than 5 consecutive years were allowed to take the NYSESLAT in lieu of the grades 3-8 ELA assessment.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: New York State Mathematics Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	May	Mar	Mar	Feb	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	90	95	72	79	56
Number of students tested	72	65	68	75	75
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	: Disadvantaged St	tudents			
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	89	97	72	79	53
Number of students tested	63	58	68	75	15
2. African American Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	93	96	76	84	56
Number of students tested	56	54	51	58	61
4. Special Education Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	95	100	93	91	63
Number of students tested	21	13	15	22	19
5. English Language Learner Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100		100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	73		62	79	21
Number of students tested	15		13	19	14
6.					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: For the 2009-2010 school year results, the NY State Education dept. raised the ELA and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the % of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, 'These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.' Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8\_Results07282010.html http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents\_Approve\_Scoring\_Changes.html'

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: NYS Testing Program English Language Arts Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2010 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	96	100	99	91	90
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	31	45	7	8	17
Number of students tested	72	65	67	74	63
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	Disadvantaged St	udents			
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	95	100	99	91	93
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	27	43	7	8	0
Number of students tested	63	58	67	74	14
2. African American Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	96	100	98	91	90
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	32	48	6	9	13
Number of students tested	56	54	50	57	52
4. Special Education Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	95	100	100	86	82
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	19	46	0	14	18
Number of students tested	21	13	15	22	17
5. English Language Learner Students					<u> </u>
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	92	83	
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	13	43	0	0	
Number of students tested	15	7	12	18	
5.					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: For the 2009-2010 school year results, the NY State Education Dept. raised the ELA and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the % of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.' Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8\_Results07282010.html http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents\_Approve\_Scoring\_Changes.html" Prior to the 2006-2007 school year, students who had attended school in the United States for less than three consecutive school years were allowed to take the NYSESLAT in lieu of the grades 3-8 English Language Arts assessment. Students not scored as proficient on the NYSESLAT and attending school in the United States for less than 5 consecutive years were allowed to take the NYSESLAT in lieu of the grades 3-8 English Language Arts assessment.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 0

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2000
Testing Month	May	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	99	100	100	100	99
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	89	86	79	80	59
Number of students tested	224	221	205	219	222
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	Disadvantaged St	tudents			
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	99	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	87	87	79	79	62
Number of students tested	204	193	205	219	41
2. African American Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	99	100	100	100	98
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	89	85	82	82	59
Number of students tested	178	176	164	170	180
4. Special Education Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	100
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	87	77	89	86	63
Number of students tested	67	57	45	50	54
5. English Language Learner Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	100	100	100	100	98
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	83	72	67	80	43
Number of students tested	69	57	49	61	56
5.					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: For the 2009-2010 school year results, the NY State Education Dept. raised the ELA and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the % of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, 'These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.' Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8\_Results07282010.html http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents\_Approve\_Scoring\_Changes.html"

Subject: Reading Grade: 0

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2000
Testing Month	Apr	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	95	98	98	92	93
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	30	27	14	16	15
Number of students tested	224	218	204	219	169
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	Disadvantaged St	udents			
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	94	97	98	91	98
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	27	24	13	16	24
Number of students tested	204	191	204	219	34
2. African American Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	95	97	98	92	94
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	33	26	13	13	14
Number of students tested	178	173	163	171	140
4. Special Education Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	88	91	96	85	80
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	24	22	5	13	15
Number of students tested	67	55	45	47	39
5. English Language Learner Students					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard	93	93	90	83	
Exceeds Proficiency Standard	30	18	2	2	
Number of students tested	69	55	48	59	
5.					
Meets and Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Exceeds Proficiency Standard					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: For the 2009-2010 school year results, the NY State Education Dept. raised the ELA and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the % of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.' Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8\_Results07282010.html http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents\_Approve\_Scoring\_Changes.html" Prior to the 2006-2007 school year, students who had attended school in the United States for less than three consecutive school years were allowed to take the NYSESLAT in lieu of the grades 3-8 English Language Arts assessment. Students not scored as proficient on the NYSESLAT and attending school in the United States for less than 5 consecutive years were allowed to take the NYSESLAT in lieu of the grades 3-8 English Language Arts assessment.